

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2018

Present: Councillor Nasrin Ali (Chair).

Councillors: Shaukat Ali, Chohan, Curley, Fender, Kamal, Paul and Watson

Apologies: Councillors Barrett, Ellison, Lovecy and Madeleine Monaghan.

Also present: Councillors: Karney, Davies, Richards, Stone, A Simcock, Mary Monaghan, Manco, Knowles, Longsdon and Rahman.

PH/18/14 Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2018 as a correct record.

PH/18/15 116137/FO/2017 - 28 Brunswick Road Manchester M20 4QB

Planning application 116137/FO/2017 was considered for the erection of a three storey rear extension to the existing property to provide an additional four apartment units, forming 16 units in total, together with the reconfiguration of the landscaping and car parking to provide 17 spaces.

This application relates to a pair of three-storey, Victorian villa-style, semi-detached properties converted into twelve apartments sitting in spacious grounds. The site is located approximately half-way down Brunswick Road, a cul-de sac-leading from Parsonage Road to the rear of properties on Arnfield Road in Withington. The property is set back from the street with a small area of trees and planting and there is hardstanding providing parking for 14 vehicles at the rear, with areas of planting and grass. The frontage of the site is bounded with a low stone wall with copings and a low hedge and gate posts at the vehicular access. A narrow and overgrown pathway runs directly to the south of the application site linking Brunswick Road with Heaton Road.

The proposal initially involved the erection of a three-storey rear extension to form an additional seven apartments, but the scheme now before Committee has been revised to reduce the footprint and bulk of the extension and consent is now sought for only four additional units.

A representative of the applicant spoke to the Committee and said that this was a high quality development that would enhance the street scene and would be completely in keeping with the surrounding area. He also pointed out that the earlier applications for planning permission had been lodged by previous owners of the property, and that this was the first application made by this owner, who purchased the property in 2016.

He told the Committee that despite the assumptions made by objectors, this was not and was not intended to be a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) but would consist of separate flats as dwelling places. He said that the current 12 flats are 92%

occupied by long term tenants, with just one flat currently vacant. The additional 4 units in the proposal were a modest increase, and complied with current planning policy.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations when making their decision. Officers confirmed that the issues raised by objectors regarding car parking had been fully addressed, and that they were satisfied that the proposed parking provision was adequate for the size of the development.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report.

(Councillor Paul was not present for all of the discussion on this item so took no part in the decision)

PH/18/16 118302/FO/2017 – Emmeline Pankhurst Statue, Adjacent To 2 St Peters Square Manchester M2 5PD

A planning application 118302/FO/2017 for the erection of a statue of Emmeline Pankhurst, adjacent to 2 St Peters Square Manchester M2 5PD was received.

The statue would be located within a 'Meeting Circle' constructed of Portland Stone. The entrance to this 'Meeting Circle' would be orientated towards the former Free Trade Hall, which is a significant location in the history of women's suffrage.

The statue would be 2.55 metres high and its pointing arm would be 1.97 metres above ground. The space between the statue and the meeting circle (excluding the arm) would be level and would be 1.95 metres wide and there would be a ring of grey coloured corduroy paving surrounding the statue to match that used in St Peters Square. The minimum distance between the edge of the 'Meeting Circle' and the nearest obstruction, which is an exit door of the adjacent building would be 5 metres.

The WoManchester Statue Project (now the Emmeline Pankhurst Statue Project) was conceived by Councillor Andrew Simcock to raise the profile and celebrate the role that women have played in the city. The project started in 2015 with a list of 20 women who have made a significant contribution to the City and Emmeline Pankhurst was chosen following a public vote.

The design, Rise Up, Women! by Hazel Reeves was selected following a design competition and a public vote.

Officers told the Committee that they had received a late representation from the owners of a nearby building that raised concerns at the proximity of the statue to the entrance to their building. The representation was clear that they were not objecting to the statue, or what it represents, but that they were concerned that the siting of the statue could potentially obstruct the entrance to the building, and the view of the commercial units situated on the ground floor of the building. They requested that the application be deferred to allow for further negotiation regarding the siting of the statue.

Officers confirmed that they had discussed the concerns raised with the applicant, who had committed to further dialogue with the owner of the building regarding the siting of the statue, and as a result officers confirmed that they did not agree that the application should be deferred.

A pupil from Newall Green Primary School spoke to the Committee in support of the application. She told the Committee that it was unfair that there was only 1 statue of a woman, Queen Victoria, in Manchester, and that the strong and simple design of the proposals would send a powerful message to residents and visitors. She told the Committee that she looked forward to visiting the statue when it was complete, and that she also looked forward to bringing her children and grandchildren to see the statue and telling them what it represented.

The Committee welcomed the application, and commented that a statue of Emmeline Pankhurst to be sited in the City was overdue. They also commented that the increased footfall generated by the statue could have a positive impact on the commercial unit situated near to the site, despite the concerns raised by the building owner. The Committee also welcomed the commitment by the applicant to engage in ongoing discussion about the precise siting of the statue, and thanked him for his co-operative approach.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report.

PH/18/17 117897/FO/2017 & 117898/LO/2017 - 123-125 Liverpool Road Manchester M3 4JN

Planning applications 117897/FO/2017 & 117898/LO/2017 for the demolition of c.1950-1960 rear extension to No.123 Liverpool Road with the creation of a new 5-storey extension and external alterations as part of proposals to refurbish and re-use No. 123 - No.125 Liverpool Road as a hotel (Use Class C1) with associated bar and restaurant (Classes A3 and A4), servicing and ancillary works and listed building consent for the demolition of c.1950-1960, non-original, rear extension to No. 123 Liverpool Road; creation of a new 5-storey extension and internal and external alterations to No. 123 and No. 125 Liverpool Road including removal of a stair case; creation of an internal connection between the buildings; replacement windows and doors; introduction of a roof light, the creation of a new access to No. 125 Liverpool Road from Woollam Place, each as part of proposals to refurbish and re-use No. 123 - No. 125 Liverpool Road as a hotel (Use Class C1) with associated bar and restaurant (Classes A3 and A4), servicing and ancillary works were received.

The application relates to a pair of Grade II listed buildings and associated land located at 123-125 Liverpool Road in Castlefield. The site is 0.7 ha and bound by Liverpool Road, Woollam Place, Old Medlock Street and residential buildings to the south on Woollam Place and Potato Wharf. It comprises of No. 123 Liverpool Road, an extension to its rear which is listed by association due to its attachment to the listed building at the front of the site and The Commercial Hotel at No. 125 Liverpool Road.

No. 123 Liverpool Road has been vacant for a number of years having originally been a pair of town houses and last used as offices. Significant internal alterations have been made and it is now largely open plan. The ground floor part of its rear extension is understood to be from the mid-20th century and was originally used as factory workshops. A first floor extension was added in the 1970s to provide additional offices and toilet accommodation.

No. 125 Liverpool Road is vacant and was last used as The Commercial Hotel with an associated ground floor bar. The ground floor has been altered significantly internally and walls were removed to create additional seating areas and a modern bar area. There is a metal fire escape to the third floor along Woollam Place and an external area used for the informal storage of bins and car parking.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent were granted in December 2011 (ref 094194/FO/2010/C1 and 094195/LO/2010/C1) to change the use of, alter and refurbish the buildings and to erect a 5 storey extension following demolition of the rear extension, to create a 39-bed boutique hotel (Use Class C1), ground floor restaurant (Use Class A3) and ancillary bar (Use Class A4). The permissions were not implemented and have since expired.

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals, stating that the provisions within the waste management plan were inadequate. He said that in his opinion the proposal that waste would be collected only once or twice a week was unrealistic, and that given the number of people that it was proposed the building would accommodate there would need to be at least daily waste collections, which would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of other residents nearby.

He also said that the proposed hotel entrance on Woollam Place could lead to nuisance for residents as people would be coming and going from the building at all hours, potentially in an intoxicated state. He said that he understood that the applicant specialised in hen and stag parties, which would make the potential problems worse. He also said that the proposals did not provide a smoking area, so he assumed that residents of the hotel would stand on Woollam Place to smoke, further reducing the amenity of other residents.

The resident also raised the issue of parking, and said that the commercial use of the property would increase parking on Woollam Place which would cause a further nuisance to residents. He pointed out that there is no bus provision on Liverpool Road, so questioned the accuracy of the report with regard to the availability of public transport.

He also raised the issue that the proposed 5 story extension would overshadow adjacent listed buildings, would be overbearing in the current setting and would have a detrimental impact in particular on the Museum of Science and Industry and Liverpool Road Station.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee in support of the application, and said that the proposals would remove a 1950's extension which had no historic value of any kind. Should the development be approved, it would reuse listed buildings, improve the physical appearance of the area and create natural surveillance. She

pointed out that the amenity issues associated with the proposal would not be uncommon in a city centre location.

The Committee were told that both buildings are currently vacant and in a poor state, and that the proposals would sympathetically refurbish the properties, and the provision of the bar and restaurant would complement existing leisure provision on Liverpool Road. She also said that the operators had vast experience in sensitive refurbishment and regeneration of historic buildings. She pointed out that a conservation led approach had been taken to the redevelopment of the building, and that the applicant had worked very closely with officers and relevant agencies to ensure that the proposals were appropriate for the setting and location.

The Committee were told that the applicant acknowledged the issues raised by residents with regard to an increase in traffic and parking, but that the property was in a highly sustainable location in the city centre, and that there were over 3000 parking spaces available within walking distance.

Residential amenity with regard to waste would be protected by a dedicated internal waste management system, and while they did understand the concerns of residents they felt that the measures proposed would be sufficient to mitigate any detriment to residents in the area.

In conclusion, the applicant's agent said that the proposal would help to create a high quality neighbourhood, economic development and sustainable travel patterns. The listed buildings would be restored and reused and the proposed extension would be well designed. The proposal would regenerate a site that has a negative impact on the area and would involve the demolition of an extension building that has an adverse impact on the listed buildings. The proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the Castlefield Conservation Area.

Officers confirmed that the applicant was happy to negotiate a stronger condition, Condition 9, regarding the construction management plan to mitigate against any disamenity during the construction and refurbishment process. Officers also confirmed that the applicant was content to include an additional condition regarding limiting the hours of operation of the proposed bar and restaurant to further mitigate against any disamenity to residents living nearby.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations when making their decision. The Committee considered that that the proposal is in accordance with the City of Manchester's planning policies and regeneration priorities including the Adopted Core Strategy, the relevant Strategic Regeneration Frameworks and the Community Strategy, as well as the national planning policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and concluded that the development should be approved, with a strengthened condition regarding the construction management plan and an additional condition regarding permitted hours of operation for the bar and restaurant.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and to delegate to the Head of Planning Building Control and Licensing, in conjunction with the Chair, further negotiation on the wording of an updated condition 9 and an additional condition regarding permitted hours of operation for the bar and restaurant.

PH/18/18 116850/FO/2017 - Olympia Trading Estate Great Jackson Street Manchester M15 4NP

A planning application 116850/FO/2017 for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and construction of three residential buildings, 32, 26 and 18 storeys in height, comprising a total of 399 residential units (C3) and 50 retirement living units (C2) with roof top ancillary restaurant; 675 sq.m of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 or D2); associated car and cycle parking within a basement level; public realm and landscaping; access and servicing arrangements; and other associated works was received.

The application proposes a mixed use development comprising three residential buildings, arranged as linear blocks, running from the south west to the north east of the site. Each would consist of a five storey podium running the length of the site with a tower element at one end. The application comprises:

- 399 residential units (Class C3), consisting of 33 per cent one bedroom apartments, 60 per cent two bedroom apartments, four per cent three bedroom apartments and three per cent three bedroom townhouses;
- 50 retirement living units (Class C2) with an ancillary roof top restaurant and communal lounges;
- 675 sqm of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 or D2);
- 97 car parking spaces at basement level;
- 399 cycle parking spaces;
- Areas of landscaped public open space along the Great Jackson Street and Owen Street frontages and between the buildings;
- Access, servicing and associated works.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that this proposal would redevelop a site that is currently occupied by unsightly industrial units. This site is at a key entrance to the City Centre and would regenerate a site that currently has a negative impact on the area. It would improve the public realm and permeability within the area, with over 46% of the site dedicated to high quality public realm.

The proposals would include the provision of a medical facility, as well as residential and retail units. The mix of residential units would be attractive to several sectors of the market, and would help to create a sustainable, varied community. The balanced mix of accommodation would also help to provide towards a shortfall of homes in the City Centre.

The Committee asked why the retirement units in the proposals were C2 usage, which includes Residential institutions and not the usual C3 usage which is classified

as a dwellinghouse. Officers confirmed that the units were intended as supported retirement accommodation, so the C2 classification was correct.

In addition the Committee asked whether the provision of the private dining facilities would be included in the price of purchasing or renting a retirement unit, and whether the retirement units would include a proper kitchen facility as well. Officers confirmed that each retirement unit would have cooking facilities, and that while they could not confirm that use of the private dining facility would be included in any rental or purchase price, this was an area that could be explored further with the applicant.

The Committee also requested that the applicant undertake consultation with representatives of Age Friendly Manchester, and officers confirmed that they would be happy to request this as it would make sense from a commercial point of view that the retirement units were a suitable and attractive option for older people. Officers also agreed that it would be appropriate to add a condition that the final management arrangements for the retirement units would be discussed with representatives of Age Friendly Manchester.

The Committee considered that the proposal is in accordance with the City of Manchester's planning policies and regeneration priorities including the Adopted Core Strategy, the relevant Strategic Regeneration Frameworks and the Community Strategy, as well as the national planning policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and should be approved.

Decision

MINDED TO APPROVE subject to a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards affordable housing, and subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation and an additional condition to allow the final management arrangements for the retirement unit to be discussed with Age Friendly Manchester.

PH/18/19 116089/FO/2017 - Land Bound by Back Turner Street, Soap Street, Shudehill and High Street, Manchester, M4 1EZ

A planning application 116089/FO/2017 for the Construction of a 122 bedroom apartment hotel (Class C1) comprising a part 4, part 5, part 8 and part 13 storey building with basement, public realm and landscaping works. Demolition of existing buildings was received.

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 16 November 2017 to enable a site visit to take place. The application was considered by the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2017, following a site visit earlier in the day. The Committee resolved to defer the application to enable officers to have discussions with the applicant regarding a reduction in height of the Shudehill component of the scheme and to allow further negotiations regarding the waste management strategy.

At the meeting of the Committee on 11 January 2018, it was reported that following discussions the applicant had confirmed that they consider this to be an appropriate response to the site and had requested that the Committee determine the proposal

as it stands. The Committee considered that the development was too high on the Shudehill frontage and that this would have a harmful effect on the setting of Shudehill. They resolved that they were minded to refuse the application on this basis and requested that a further report be presented setting out potential reasons for refusal.

A local resident spoke to the Committee to object to the proposal, and said that the repeated submission of the application despite opposition from residents, Councillors and the Committee showed that the applicant must have the opinion that the concerns and objections of all parties could be ignored. She said that there were significant inaccuracies in the report, for example the assertion that Soap Street was not used as a through road was not the case in her experience as a resident overlooking Soap Street. In addition, she said that the proposals did not reflect the heritage quality of the area, and would have a detrimental impact on the setting of neighbouring Victorian and Georgian architecture, and the Smithfield conservation area as a whole.

The resident said that she accepted that change is inevitable, but that change should enhance the existing character of an area, not damage it.

A Cllr Davies spoke to the Committee in support of the residents objections. She said that her representation was on behalf of all the City Centre Councillors, as well as the city Centre spokesperson, Cllr Karney and Cllr Manco from the adjoining ward. She said that Councillors would welcome appropriate development of the site, but that the current proposals were completely inappropriate for the sensitive setting at the Shudehill elevation. She explained that the height of the building at the Shudehill elevation was completely out of line with the surrounding low rise buildings. She pointed out that buildings directly adjacent to the site had been sensitively regenerated, and that it is possible to revitalise without a building being over imposing or over shadowing.

Cllr Davies added that the low rise workshops and living accommodation found in the vicinity are as much a part of Manchester historic heritage as the larger mills and industrial buildings, and should receive the same protection.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee in support of the application. He said that the proposals were proportionate and appropriate for the site, and would provide much needed regeneration of a site that was currently in very poor condition, and an eyesore. He said that there had been a rigorous pre-application process, and officers had worked very closely with the applicant to ensure that the best possible scheme was proposed.

He said that they do recognise the concerns of residents and Councillors, but that this is a very difficult site and the development has been adjusted to reflect this. He told the Committee that they had not anticipated the number of concerns or the strength of feeling about the proposals.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations that had been made both in the written report and verbally. They decided that the proposals were too

high at the Shudehill elevation of the site, and that they could not therefore approve the application.

Decision

To refuse the application as the height of the building on Shudehill would have an unacceptable relationship to its context and would be overdominant in the streetscene. This would have a harmful effect on the Smithfield Conservation area.

PH/18/20 118120/FO/2017 - Land Bounded By Thompson Street / Mason Street / Bendix Street and Rochdale Road Manchester

A planning application 118120/FO/2017 for the erection of a part 15, part 9, part 7 storey building to form 155 residential apartments together with ground floor commercial uses (Use Classes A1, A3 and B1) (288 sqm) with associated car parking, access arrangements and other associated works following the demolition of existing buildings and structure and the closure of Hatter Street was received.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that the report gave a comprehensive explanation of the scope and concept of the proposed development. This is a significant development for the applicant company, and will become their flagship building within Manchester City Centre. The applicant is committed to delivering a scheme of the highest quality, with generous accommodation, and the agent said that the proposal will see the redevelopment of a vacant brownfield site within the heart of one of Manchester's key regeneration.

A total of 155 residential units (which will be available for private rent) will be created, along with commercial space, which will contribute to the City's residential growth strategy and help support neighbourhoods of choice by introducing private rented residential accommodation and flexible commercial units attractive to niche businesses. The applicant will support local labour which will help recruit local people.

The Committee were told that the application site falls within the New Cross Development Framework which sets out the vision for the regeneration of the area. Currently the area suffers from limited activity, a poor quality built environment and public realm. As a result of the framework, the area is, however, in transition with the framework setting out the form and nature of development to come forward within the area. As a result, the New Cross area is expected to undergo significant regeneration over the coming years as a result of its close proximity to the City Centre through the implementation of the Framework which envisages large scale residential development to be developed as part of meeting the City's population growth.

The Committee queried the need to close Hatter Street as a thoroughfare, and officers confirmed that this would be necessary to deliver the public realm improvements that would be part of the proposed development.

Decision

Minded to approve, subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement with regards of off-site affordable housing and public realm and infrastructure improvements within the New Cross Area.

PH/18/21 117846/VO/2017 - Nutsford Vale Matthews Lane Manchester

A planning application 117846/VO/2017 for the erection of a three storey detached school building with rooftop plant, detached single storey indoor sports facility with double height sports hall and studio, with associated access, parking and circulation areas, formation of outdoor sports facilities, external play space, landscaping, boundary treatment and associated works was received.

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 11th January 2018 to enable a site visit to take place to allow members to look at possible traffic and environmental impacts.

The proposed development comprises a secondary school which would initially accept a single intake of 240 year 7 pupils, with year 7 cohorts accepted each year, eventually catering to 1200 pupils, aged 11-16, by 2024, being taught by 270 full time members of staff in a three storey new build facility comprising 8,900 sqm of gross internal floor area.

The proposed school building would be positioned towards the southern boundary in the southwestern corner of the site, but set behind retained trees which front Matthews Lane and an arrival plaza.

A representative of the "Friends of Nutsford Vale" spoke to the Committee in objection to the proposals. He said that this was a much needed open space for residents of Gorton and the surrounding area, and questioned whether the need for a school in this location was correct, given there was capacity at the nearby Gorton Education Village. In addition, the loss of habitat for many species of wildlife, including declining species such as bees. He added that the local road network is already at full capacity and further congestion and air pollution cannot be tolerated by residents, particularly children, elderly and people with existing health conditions.

He said that local people had put years of effort into developing a former landfill site into a country park, and that the local community, including Councillors and the local MP were unanimously opposed to a school being built on the site. He said that many people, including children, who live in the area do not have gardens, and the only opportunity that they have for outside activities such as walking, cycling or running is to access Nutsford Vale. He said that the provision of sport facilities was not sufficient mitigation to offset the detrimental impact the proposals would have.

Councillors Stone and Richards also spoke in objection to the proposals, saying that they completely supported resident objections. They said that the development was inappropriate and asked for further clarification as to whether a school was needed given the already stated spare capacity at Gorton Education Village. They acknowledged that there is significant pressure on school places in Manchester, but

said that this was the wrong scheme in the wrong place as this was no longer a brownfield site but a country park. Councillor Stone told the Committee that several other sites had been proposed, but that the other options had been dismissed without proper investigation. Councillor Stone also said that the number of trees that would be removed would have a detrimental impact on air quality, which was already very poor, especially along Matthews Lane. He added that he acknowledged there would be a travel plan, but said that the best travel plan in the world would not stop people taking children to school in their cars.

Councillor Richards also spoke in support of the objections and said that the role of a Councillor is to create and support communities and their residents, and the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental impact on local people both in Gorton and the surrounding areas. No mitigation in the form of sport facilities would be sufficient to address the loss of this green space.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and said that while they acknowledged the concerns raised by residents and Councillors, Manchester was undergoing a significant population increase, with families moving to the area who had children who will need to be schooled. She said that current school places were not sufficient, and as the population of Manchester continued to rise new schools were needed. She explained that the Council has a statutory duty to fulfil this need, and that if they failed to do so this would have a significant impact on the Council both reputationally and financially. The lack of provision would also have an impact on the children themselves, as many would have to travel long distances for a school place.

Efforts have been made to address the problem by expanding existing primary and secondary schools, but this has been of limited success, as schools have finite space and resources available to them.

The applicant acknowledged the concerns raised about potential ground contamination, but said that this issue had been taken very seriously and tested thoroughly to the point that the applicant was confident that this site would be made safe. The testing has also been subject to independent review, and the proposed mitigation has been deemed appropriate and more than adequate.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations when making their decision. The Committee acknowledged the strength of local opposition to the proposals, and commented that this was a very difficult decision to make.

The Committee concluded that ultimately a judgement has to be made and key policy objectives weighed; in this instance there is an overwhelming need for school places in the area, which, it appears cannot be provided on an alternative site, or in alternative locations.

The proposal is for a new secondary school in response to the identified need which is an essential facility to serve the local community.

The proposal offers the opportunity to properly deal with the legacy of contamination on the site as set out in the body of the report.

In mitigation for reducing the area of open space, it is proposed to improve the remainder of Nutsford Vale and there would be a net gain in access to formal sporting facilities.

Decision

Minded to approve (subject to a response from the Secretary of State)

PH/18/22 118506/FH/2017 - 133 Belgrave Road Manchester M40 3SX

A planning application 118506/FH/2017 for the erection of two storey side and part single, part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation was received.

133 Belgrave Road is a two storey, detached property situated within a mixed row of terraced and detached properties along Belgrave Road. The property lies within a predominantly residential area of Moston in North Manchester. The property benefits from part single and part two storey rear outriggers, small garden area to the front and larger areas to the side and rear of the property. In addition an off street car parking space is provided to the side of the property and various boundary treatments, which consist of low boundary wall, railings and timber fencing.

The submitted application is for the erection of two storey side and part single, part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

Decision

To approve the application.

PH/18/23 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (51 Catterick Road, Didsbury) Tree Preservation Order 2017

An objection to a tree preservation order JK 23/08/17 at 51 Catterick Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6HF was received.

On the 22nd August 2017 a concerned party reported that a request had been made for a price for removal of a mature Beech tree within the front garden of 51 Catterick Road, Manchester and asked for an emergency TPO to be made on the tree. On the advice of the City Arborist following a site visit, a TPO was made on the tree on 23rd August, 2017.

The City Arborist considered the tree to be a mature Beech worthy of a TPO due to its high visibility, being both a large tree situated in a prominent position. This tree is approximately 15m in height and with an average crown diameter of 10m. The Helliwell System 2008 of visual amenity valuation has been carried out and this assessment found the tree to be of high visual amenity value.

An objection has been received from the owner of the 51 Catterick Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6HF

In summary she states:

- The Beech tree is not under threat of either immediate removal or in the foreseeable future. A TPO should not be made on the grounds of the adjacent landowner's suspicion, 'hear-say' or assumptions. The enquiry was for cosmetic pruning for health and safety pruning.
- The tree now extends to the owners roof and is in direct contact with and blocking drains with moss and heavy leaf debris on the roof.
- Lighter branches are falling which may cause harm/damage to pedestrians, parked and moving vehicles.
- The tree does need pruning from time to time and the making of a TPO would require unnecessary use of additional resources for the owner and the City Council.

The City Arborist carried out a site survey and states this mature Beech to be a large tree with no obvious defects. He states that it is growing in a prominent position and as such is of high visual amenity value and meets the criteria of being protected by a TPO.

It is considered that the Beech (T1) as shown on the attached plan, should be protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The City Arborist considers the tree to be in good condition, healthy with no known major defects. This Beech tree is of high amenity value, located in a prominent position within the front garden, highly visible to and enjoyed by a significant number of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties and from vehicular traffic and pedestrians on Catterick Road, in particular. This tree is an important element of the local landscape character and its biodiversity.

The Order has been properly made in the interests of securing the contribution this tree makes to the public amenity value in the area. The concerns of the homeowner have been fully considered and balanced against the contribution this Beech tree makes to the local environment. Whilst it is acknowledged that the reason for objecting to the TPO, in particular concerns that the tree is not under imminent threat, a TPO would result in additional resources being used and that the tree has been dropping debris onto the property and highway, it is not felt that they outweigh the significant contribution this tree of high amenity value makes to the area.

Decision

To instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order at 51 Catterick Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6HF, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the trees as plotted on the plan attached to the report.